

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Change of Attorney Docket Number

Applicant respectfully requests that the Attorney Docket Number be changed from “SUN-P6043” to “03226/533001; 6043”.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 16, and 22 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 12, 16, and 22.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1, 12, 16, and 22 are amended to clarify the present invention. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, on page 9, lines 18-25 to page 10 lines 1-7 of the instant specification. Applicant asserts that no new subject matter is added by way of these claim amendments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 6 is rejected for insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 6 is amended to recite “said plurality of CA clone servers” according to Examiners remarks. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 8, 12-18, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,044,462 (“Zubeldia”) in view of the Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art (“AAPA”). To the extent this rejection still applies to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See MPEP section 706.02(j).

Applicant asserts that Zubeldia fails to teach a single CRL that is centralized where the single CRL associated with a single certificate authority (CA) includes a master server coupled to a plurality of CA clone servers. The portion of Zubeldia that the Examiner relies upon to teach this element of the claims merely teaches having a centralized configuration where *multiple* certificate authorities (CAs) may transmit certificate validity information, which is then maintained in a central database. (See Zubeldia col. 7 ll. 38-40 and Figure 6). In fact, Applicant asserts that Zubeldia actually teaches away from the present invention because a *single* CRL from a *single* CA is not the result of transmitting the certificate validity information from the multiple CAs.

As taught by Zubeldia, each of the multiple CAs maintains a separate CRL, which is then transmitted to a central database. (See, e.g., Zubeldia col. 3 ll. 10-13, and 31-33 and col. 7 ll. 7-15). Thus, in contrast to the present invention as recited in the amended claims (which includes a *single* CA associated with a *single* CRL), Zubeldia teaches CAs with *multiple* CRLs that are maintained as a historically related CRLs in a central database (See, e.g., Zubeldia col.5 ll. 2-5). Instead of teaching creating a *single* CRL list for a single CA as recited in the claims of the present invention, Zubeldia teaches having multiple CRLs associated with various CAs and storing them in one location (*i.e.*, the central database).

In view of the above, Zubeldia fails to support the rejection of amended independent claims 1, 12, and 16. Furthermore, the AAPA does not teach that which Zubeldia lacks. Specifically, the AAPA does not teach having a single centralized CRL. Rather, each CA clone server in the AAPA maintains an individual, identical CRL. (See, e.g., Instant Specification p. 7 ll.

21-22). Thus, the AAPA discloses a method including multiple CRLs instead of a *single* CRL from a single CA as recited in the claims of the present invention.

In view of the above, Zubeldia and the AAPA, whether considered separately or together, do not support the rejection of amended independent claims 1, 12, and 16. Dependent claims 2-4, 7-8, 13-15, 17, 18, and 21, which depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 12, and 16, are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 10, 11, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,044,462 (“Zubeldia”) in view of the Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art (“AAPA”) in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0080719 (“Parkvall”). To the extent the rejection still applies to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

For the same reasons stated above, neither Zubeldia nor the AAPA support the rejection of amended independent claim 1 and 16. Further, Parkvall does not teach that which Zubeldia and the AAPA lack. Specifically, a *single* CRL list for a single CA as recited in the claims of the present invention is not taught or suggested by Parkvall.

Moreover, Applicant asserts that a suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings does not exist between Zubeldia, the AAPA, and Parkvall as required by MPEP 706.02(j). In fact, Parkvall is directed to secure communication specific to wireless radio communications. Parkvall is silent with reference to cluster systems with revocation lists of a master server coupled to a plurality of Certificate Authority clone servers. Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that one with ordinary skill in the art in the area cluster system security would not look to Parkvall because it deals with security specific to wireless radio communications. Thus, there is no motivation to combine Zubeldia, the AAPA, and Parkvall.

In view of the above, Zubeldia, the AAPA, and Parkvall whether considered separately or together, do not support the rejection of amended independent claims 1 and 16. Dependent claims 5, 10, 11 and 19, which depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 16, are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 6, 9, 19, 20, and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,044,462 ("Zubeldia") in view of the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in further view of Oracle Internet Directory Administrator's Guide ("Oracle"). To the extent the rejection still applies to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to amended independent claim 22, the Examiner has incorporated the rejection of claim 16 and has only relied upon Oracle to teach that the database is an LDAP database. (See Office Action mailed March 7, 2005, pp. 7-9). For the same reasons stated above, neither Zubeldia nor the AAPA support the rejection of amended independent claims 1 and 16. Further, Oracle does not teach that which Zubeldia and the AAPA lack. Specifically, a *single* CRL list for a single CA as recited in the claims of the present invention is not taught or suggested by Oracle.

In view of the above, Zubeldia, the AAPA, and Oracle, whether considered separately or together, do not support the rejection of amended independent claims 1, 16, and 22. Dependent claims 5, 6, 9, 19, 20, and 24, which depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 16, and 22, are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.


Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below.

• Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/533001).

Dated: June 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert P. Lord

Registration No.: 46,479

(713) 228-8600

(713) 228-8778 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant